

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy shown during the interview on October 4, 2004. As noted on the interview summary record, it was agreed that the specification is, in fact, enabling for the full scope of Claim 1 with respect to the activity of any μ or κ opioid peptides, and is not limited to only the ratio of β -endorphin and dynorphin A. In addition, it was agreed that lichen is a pruritic disease as recited in the claim. Therefore, it is believed that the 35 USC §112 first paragraph rejection set forth in the Office Action has been overcome.

With respect to the rejection under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, it was agreed that hemodialysis and peritoneal dialysis are not diseases. As discussed during the interview, these conditions or procedures have been cancelled from Claims 6 and 12.

In light of the agreement reached during the interview and the reasons set forth above, it is requested that the rejections and objections set forth in the last Office Action be reconsidered and withdrawn. It is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicants

TDC:SAN:vbm
(215) 656-3381